

REMARKS

Favorable reconsideration of this application as presented herein is requested. Claims 1-21 and 23-26 are pending in this application. Claims 1, 3, 4, 25 and 26 have been amended. No new matter has been added.

Claim rejections under 35 U.S.C. § 103

Claims 1-21, 23, 25 and 26 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Lawson (U.S. Patent No. 6,185,613) in view of Kleewein (U.S. Patent No. 5,903,893). The Examiner states that Kleewein teaches the union of a local and remote table to form a combined database. With respect, the Examiner's argument has become moot in light of the new amendments. Claims 1, 3, 4, 25 and 26 have been amended in order to mention that the monitoring locations update one another when their event data changes. (See Applicants' Specification, p.4 l.12). This is not described in Kleewein. Kleewein merely describes joining entries of two tables and comparing the count with a threshold value. (See column 3, l.16).

Additionally, absent hindsight of Applicants' invention, there is no motivation or teaching to combine Lawson with the Kleewein reference because Lawson describes event notification and delivery in a computing environment, whereas Kleewein describes merging databases.

Applicants thus respectfully submit that claims 1, 3, 4, 25 and 26 are not rendered obvious by the Lawson and Kleewein Patents when considered alone or in combination. Claims 2, 5-21 and 23 depend from claims 1, 3, 4, 25 and 26 and therefore include all the limitations of those independent claims. Since Lawson and Kleewein do not render claims 1-21, 23, 25 and 26 unpatentable Applicants respectfully submit that the rejections thereof be withdrawn by the Examiner.

Claim 24 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Lawson in view of Kleewein and further in view of Tsukerman (U.S. Patent No. 6,341,340). For the reasons mentioned above, Applicants respectfully submit that claim 4 is not rendered obvious by the


Lawson and Kleewein Patents when considered alone or in combination with Tsukerman. Claim 24 depends from claim 4 and therefore includes all the limitations of that independent claim. Since Lawson, Kleewein and Tsukerman do not render claim 24 unpatentable Applicants respectfully submit that the rejection thereof be withdrawn by the Examiner.

It is asserted that the present communication places the application in a form for allowance. Entry is earnestly solicited.

The Commissioner is authorized to charge any deficiency or credit any overpayment to Deposit Account No. 02-4270.

Respectfully submitted,

Date: 01/26/06


 Art Kane
 Reg. No. L0048
 BROWN RAYSMAN MILLSTEIN
 FELDER & STEINER LLP
 900 Third Avenue
 New York, New York 10022
 Tel : (212) 895-2000
 Fax: (212) 895-2900

I hereby certify that the correspondence attached herewith is being transmitted by first class mail to Mail Stop RCE, Commissioner for Patents, Box 1450, Alexandria, VA 22313-1450:


 Annette Mejia
 Date 1/26/06

Customer No. 29858